

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

9 ALDO DAVICO, JR.,

O R D E R
Civ. No. 05-6052-TC

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 GLAXO SMITHKLINE
13 PHARMACEUTICALS, a foreign
14 corporation,

15 Defendant.

16 AIKEN, Judge:

17 Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and
18 Recommendation on August 2, 2007. The matter is now before me
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).
20 When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings
21 and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo
22 determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28
23 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore
24 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.
25 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

26 Plaintiff has timely filed objections. I have, therefore,
27 given the file of this case a de novo review. I ADOPT the
28 Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation (doc. 109) that

1 defendant's motion for summary judgment (doc. 62) is granted and
2 this case is dismissed. Further, the court declines to consider
3 new evidence, nor allow the plaintiff to conduct additional
4 discovery. See United States v. Howell, 231 F.3d 615, 621-22 (9th
5 Cir. 2000; and the record before this court detailing the
6 discovery process before Judge Coffin.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8
9 Dated this 9 day of October 2007.

10
11
12
13 /s/ Ann Aiken
14 Ann Aiken
United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28